

**TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES  
SPECIAL MEETING  
December 12, 2007**

*Chair Knox White* called the Transportation Commission to order at 7:30 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL** – Roll was called and the following recorded.

Members Present:

John Knox White  
Michael Krueger  
Robert McFarland  
Robb Ratto  
Eric Schatmeier  
Srikant Subramaniam

Members Absent:

Nielsen Tam

Staff Present:

Obaid Khan, Supervising Civil Engineer  
Barry Bergman, Transportation Coordinator

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. October 17, 2007 Special Meeting
- b. October 24, 2007

*Chair Knox White* noted that page 12 read, “*Chair Knox White* noted that the Transportation Commission would recommend that this issue return to the City Council.” He clarified that the TC recommendations were to be sent back to the City Council.

*Commissioner Krueger* moved approval of the minutes for the October 17, 2007, special meeting and October 24, 2007 minutes, as amended. *Commissioner Ratto* seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

2. **AGENDA CHANGES**

*Chair Knox White* noted that since the audience members are attending to comment on Item 7-B, that it be heard first, followed by Item 7-C and then 7-A.

*Chair Knox White* noted that *Commissioner Schatmeier* arrived.

#### **4. COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS**

##### **a. Pedestrian Plan Task Force**

*Chair Knox White* noted that he would ask *Commissioner Tam* to replace former Commissioner Knoth as the third member of the subcommittee. He noted that they met quickly for an update, and a pedestrian plan proposal would be presented in the spring.

*Staff Khan* noted that the plan was a preliminary draft, which presented the existing information gathered to date. The project selection and cost issues had not been addressed.

*Chair Knox White* noted that several members of the public had attended as well.

##### **b. Alameda Point Task Force**

*Chair Knox White* noted that the last meeting had been canceled, and that the next meeting would be held December 13, 2007.

#### **5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

##### **Open public hearing.**

There were none.

##### **Close public hearing.**

#### **6. OLD BUSINESS**

There was none.

#### **7. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **7B. Approval of Parking Removal to Provide Adequate Stopping Areas for Bus Stops Along Encinal Avenue Between Mound Street and High Street.**

*Staff Bergman* summarized the staff report, and noted that it was recommended that the City be flexible wherever possible and consolidate stops where appropriate. He displayed the proposed alternative changes. Alternative 1 had more of an impact on parking; Alternative 2 had received public comment and concern; Alternative 3, by changing the location of the westbound stop, placed a stop on the near side of the intersection, which was not preferred in bus operations (Alternative 2 would have a stop on the far side of the intersection); Alternatives 4 and 5 would have exceeded the spacing guidelines, which staff preferred to avoid. The ridership numbers were highest at the Encinal and High (33 riders per day), and Encinal and Fountain (11 per day) stops. The recommendation of removing those two stops would have meant removing the two

more heavily used stops. As a result of those figures and community feedback, staff recommended keeping the stops at those locations, and implementing the parking restrictions, which would mean installing red curb at Encinal and Mound, impacting three parking spaces on the westbound side of the street. Staff recommended limited parking restrictions at the Encinal/High and Encinal/Fountain stops, based on the hours of bus operations.

In response to an inquiry by *Commissioner Schatmeier* whether any of the proposed changes would impact running times on Line 63, *Staff Bergman* replied that staff could not determine that to be so.

*Commissioner Krueger* believed there was an inconsistency in the labeling of Alternatives 4 and 5 with respect to page 2 and Attachment 3. *Staff Bergman* replied that the real Alternative 4 was identified correctly in the table. On page 2, Alternatives 4 and 5 should be swapped.

### **Open public comment.**

Rachel Allen, 1231 Court Street, noted that she was opposed to Alternatives 2 and 3, which would place a new bus stop on the corner of Court and Encinal. She was opposed to the proposal between of the impacted shared parking with the church. She noted that the crosswalk was used by students, and she was concerned about the safety of a special needs child living nearby. She supported Alternative 1.

Katherine Neal Manalo, 2919 Encinal, expressed concern about her son's health related to noise and pollution, affecting his asthma and pulmonary problems. She believed that Alternative 3 would be a problem, especially the students who .may dart into the street. She appreciated the bus service, and supported Alternative 1; she suggested eliminating the Mound stops.

Dave Nederhood, Pastor, ACLC, noted that the church did not have off-street parking. He presented signatures from church members in support of Alternative 1.

Cliff Reese, 3004 Encinal Avenue, spoke in support of Alternative 1. He noted that 3014 Encinal was a four-plex, with two drivers per unit. He added that they shared the eight parking spaces with that building.

Mark Betts, 1300 Mound Street, noted that his house was only seven feet from the sidewalk. He noted that on Mound, there were nine houses with no off-street parking. He noted that there was only five feet between the retaining wall to the telephone pole. He noted that on Court Street, there was 21 feet from the house to the curb, which was enough room to attenuate the noise. He noted that his house and sidewalk were cracking from the vibration impact from Mound Street.

### **Close public comment.**

*Commissioner Schatmeier* noted that he supported the staff recommendations, and believed that with respect to the existing bus stop at High and Encinal (OX), it was impossible to for a bus to make the tight right turn at High and also be able to stop at the red curb. *Staff Bergman* noted that he had not heard from AC Transit operations, but staff would look into that issue.

*Commissioner Krueger* understood the point made by *Commissioner Schatmeier*, but did not necessarily agree that it would justify removing the parking restriction. He believed that it was still necessary to keep the cars from parking there. He suggested that it may be better to relocate the stop.

*Commissioner Krueger* inquired about the final agreements that resulted from the community meetings. *Staff Bergman* noted that he would contact Mr. Betts regarding the outcome of the community meetings regarding the stops on Encinal.

*Commissioner Krueger* noted that he was disappointed that there was not some opportunity to clean up the stops, which seemed to be somewhat confusing. He would have been inclined towards the consolidation option before hearing the public comment, but that seemed to be the will of the Commission.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* moved to approve the staff recommendation. *Commissioner McFarland* seconded the motion. Motion passed 5-0.

#### **7-C. Review and Comment on the Update to the Economic Development Strategic Plan.**

*Eric Fonstein*, Economic Development Coordinator, Development Services Department, presented the staff report and described the Economic Development Strategic Plan. He noted that this presentation was a mid-point review, and noted that the EDSP was not intended to supersede the City's policy documents. He detailed the Plan's seven economic priorities:

1. create industrial and office jobs;
2. increase the quality and availability of retail jobs and services;
3. promote business travel and limited impact tourist attractions;
4. create recreational and entertainment facilities;
5. provide internal and external traffic circulation;
6. foster new enterprises; and
7. promote administrative hearing.

He noted that the Economic Development Commission endorsed the plan at its last meeting, and added the inclusion of a vision statement, which was included in the Commission packet. They also wished to include an overall direction of the Strategic Plan as a core statement. The Planning Board also endorsed the plan in its most recent meeting.

#### **Open public hearing.**

There were no speakers.

### **Close public hearing.**

*Commissioner Krueger* inquired why the results of the telephone survey did not match the City's demographics as a whole, and would like to include the Census figures to identify the discrepancies.

*Chair Knox White* noted that the mid-term goal on page 8 of "working with regional, state and federal agencies to provide stable funding for a BART shuttle service to Marina Village Business Park" should be connected with the existing Line 19 service every half hour. He believed the document should acknowledge the existence of the service. He noted that the Planning Board was working on green building codes, and recommended that it be a near-term, rather than a mid-term goal. He noted that a long-term goal was the development of residential space at Alameda Point, which identified the development of green standards, and suggested that the role of mixed use be included in sustainable, green development. He noted that the current parking study was a near- and mid-term goal, and inquired when it would be addressed.

*Staff Fonstein* replied that Planning and Building, Development Services and Public Works were taking their time to closely examine the statistical analysis before bringing it forth. Staff hoped to present the document early in 2008.

*Chair Knox White* noted that the long-term plan to have a center at Alameda Point with retail shops, including an anchor grocery store and links to transit nodes, should mention mixed use as a way to achieve the Transportation Commission's long-term goals. He hoped that the larger, more historic trees could be retained, or not be replaced with much smaller trees. He noted that he had attended many outdoor movies in the park, and noted that they were shown at the park that was furthest from most of the housing. He suggested holding them at some of the parks in central Alameda to reduce the amount of driving.

*Chair Knox White* agreed that creating bike paths in lanes throughout Alameda Point would be a good goal, but did not understand why it was listed under "Recreation and Entertainment" on page 19. He believed that bike paths certainly belonged under "Recreation," but that bike lanes should be included in the Internal/External Traffic Circulation section because of their importance in everyday travel. On page 21, he did not understand the near-term goal of exploring public transit with shorter routes and shuttles. He noted that the many shuttle discussions included the need for efficient and well-run routes, and he did not believe the survey clarified what shuttles meant to people. He noted that page 22 should read "Emery Go-Round," not "Emeryville Go-round." He noted that the long-term goal on page 23 to create a seamless network of streets to "achieve integration throughout the City, and to minimize traffic congestion," seemed to not be consistent with the policies stated by the City Council's EIR policies to use streets to minimize traffic congestion. He believed that Alameda Point should be integrated into the street grid. *Staff Khan* believed the intention was to minimize congestion by adding TSM or TDM measures, not by adding or widening streets. He noted that the goal was to minimize congestion. *Chair Knox White* requested that the language be clarified.

*Commissioner Krueger* noted that he was also curious about the shuttle issue, and wondered whether the shuttle issue had been explored in other ways. He inquired whether people wanted a shuttle because it was free, or because it was not run by AC Transit, or whether it was because it had a different route. *Staff Fonstein* replied that with respect to the Marina Village Business Park, staff met annually with the human resource directors of major companies in Alameda to build a good rapport with businesses. He noted that the human resource directors that that was a desire. It could be a more tailored program, or lack of publicity of existing services at this time.

*Commissioner Krueger* noted that he worked at Wind River, and that an announcement was sent out soliciting employee feedback on a BART shuttle. He responded to the contact at the human resources department, stating that there was a bus that ran every half hour to two different BART stations, stopping in front of Wind River; she was not aware that there was a bus, and the company dropped the survey at that point. He believed that the shuttle could be explored further, and wondered how much of it was a demand for something different, and how much was the lack of knowledge about existing services. He suggested that bus passes or other incentives could be used to augment the existing services.

*Chair Knox White* noted that Peralta College just voted to provide the students with free bus passes.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* believed that there was an inaccurate public perception that buses were seen as dirty and noisy, and that shuttles were seen in a much more positive light. He would like to see the consciousness regarding the two forms of public transit to be raised.

*Commissioner Ratto* agreed with *Commissioner Schatmeier's* comments, and noted that Table 2 on page 13 should include mention of the stations regarding the façade grant program, as well as for the storefronts. He did not believe that *Chair Knox White's* wishes regarding the trees would come to pass; he noted that the new lighting on Park Street was much closer together than the old cobra lighting, which necessitated the removal of many old trees for spacing. He added that there were two dead trees in front of the Hob Nob that should be removed. He added that a tree midblock northbound, coming up from Alameda Towne Centre was leaning into the second transit lane. With respect to in lieu fees, he inquired where DSD had determined where they would be feasible. He noted that PSBA would push for an exemption next year.

*Chair Knox White* noted that some of the street lights were very bright and intrusive.

*Commissioner Ratto* disagreed, and noted that there were both inside and outside lights that were intended for illuminating the sidewalks and transit lanes.

*Staff Fonstein* noted that the Planning Board had recommended that the title of Strategy 5, which read, "Internal and External Traffic Circulation" should be changed to "Multimodal" instead of "Traffic."

<p><i>Commissioner Ratto</i> moved to accept the proposal with the attached Commission comments. <i>Commissioner Krueger</i> seconded the motion. Motion passed 5-0.</p>
--

## **7-A. Review of Practices to Evaluate Development Impacts to Bicycles, Pedestrians and Transit.**

*Staff Khan* presented the staff report. He described the LOS practices used in Palo Alto, as well as in Florida, for different modes of transportation, and then evaluating them in advance of development that occurs. He noted that they examined the effective green time for a pedestrian to cross an intersection in conjunction with the cycle length of the signalized intersection. He noted that this method was simple to calculate. At unsignalized crossings, the method examines how many gaps were available in the traffic stream. It also examined how much delay a pedestrian would experience. The Highway Capacity Manual also has a method for calculating bicycle impacts, and looked at substantial additional data that would be needed to calculate that information. He noted that Florida Department of Transportation (DOT) recommended avoiding using one LOS method for all modes. The consultant looked at the combination of the Highway Capacity Manual method to calculate the delay to pedestrians, transit and other modes like bicycles.

*Staff Khan* noted that it was important to establish a quantitative method to simplify the calculations, and to provide better information to developers. For the impacts on bicyclists, staff recommended using the method used by the Florida DOT, which used physical parameters in conjunction with the volumes and the speeds on a street. Staff was considering the Highway Capacity method, which gave a delay for each approach at an intersection. On a corridor basis, staff recommended, and AC Transit has supported, using the corridorwide analysis (Arterial Level of Service analysis), which provided the travel time or delays on an arterial or a street. It took several intersections in the analysis into account, and provided the total delay that a line can experience.

*Chair Knox White* noted that Dowling Associates had worked on a similar project for the City of San Francisco, and he was surprised to see very little of their work in this report. *Staff Khan* replied that he asked the same question, and Dowling stated that they took it into account; they also stated that they were also working for the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to develop standards for a highway capacity manual. He understood that knowledge was incorporated in this study.

At the request of *Chair Knox White*, *Staff Khan* read the letter from Nathan Landau of AC Transit, regarding the report and the recommendation of transit. AC Transit was interested in looking at corridorwide impacts; staff was also interested in using intersections as well. He noted that he had not received specific direction regarding CEQA issues.

*Chair Knox White* noted that as multiple LOS standards are set up for multiple transportation forms, there will be conflicts, especially when possible mitigations impact other modes. He inquired about the process going forward with respect to any tradeoffs and consistency in the process.

*Staff Khan* noted that public process would be critical, and he hoped that at the beginning of 2008, there would be more specifics in terms of the intersection impacts. He believed it would be a policy decision.

*Chair Knox White* noted that reality often did not line up with a report's predictions, and noted that sometimes, mitigations at an intersection did not change the congestion at the next intersection, resulting in an unchanged travel time.

*Staff Khan* agreed with that point, and noted that many EIRs did not address what would happen in the intersection upstream from the congested intersection. Staff recommended including arterial level of service criteria as well, which would also help the transit analysis.

*Chair Knox White* was concerned about using the HCM pedestrian information, because it was information already collected for cars at an intersection. He understood that this was a model, and noted that the City may decide that it is too complicated and nuanced. He also believed that it should be thoroughly examined. He inquired when it would be completed.

*Staff Khan* replied that it was promised for the summer of 2008, and added that public input and feedback would be critical.

*Commissioner Krueger* echoed *Chair Knox White's* comments about pedestrians, and while he supported a simple, quantitative model, he also supported considering capturing other factors besides delay, perhaps in a future refinement. He believed that qualitative factors that influence the choice of intersections did not reflect delay, but affected pedestrians more than drivers. He noted that the bicycle discussion addressed the environment more than delay. He would like to see more balance in that aspect of the report. He noted that having to stop, even without a delay, was more of a burden for bicyclists than for pedestrians or drivers. He added that when he biked, he avoided streets with stop signs, sometimes in favor of streets with lights. He would like to see more balance in that respect.

*Chair Knox White* agreed with staff's recommendation to have a list of various LOSs for various modes.

## **8. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS**

*Staff Khan* noted that MTC requested the Transportation Commission's input for the next 25-year plan being developed. The survey was being conducted, and examined issues like global warming, congestion, emissions and other issues. The website address is: [www.mtc.ca.gov/t2035](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/t2035).

*Commissioner Ratto* requested that *Staff Khan* email the link to the Commissioners.

*Chair Knox White* suggested that the URL be posted on the City's website.



**a. Future Meetings**

*Staff Khan* noted that staff would look at those methods in February. He added that the car share presentation would be made in January. He believed the parking study would be presented in early 2008.

*Chair Knox White* noted that with respect to the ferries, a staff member from Senator Perata's office stated that they would be willing to have a public meeting in Alameda, possibly in January at the Transportation Commission to discuss the cleanup language.

*Staff Khan* noted that he tried to get more information from the City Manager's office, but none was available at this time.

**b. Broadway/Jackson**

*Staff Khan* noted that a traffic simulation and analysis had been prepared, and staff has been reviewing the recommendations in terms of traffic patterns on the other side of the Tube. Future development and traffic flow through the Tube was also under review. The next step would be get the feedback for a presentation in early 2008.

*Commissioner Ratto* suggested that staff begin an outreach to the other business associations.

*Commissioner Krueger* requested an update on the status of the effort to install red curbs at bus stops.

*Staff Bergman* noted that there were three or four curbs that required further follow-up.

*Staff Khan* noted that the Line 63 item would go to City Council on January 15, 2008. Staff would send the Transportation Commission's recommendation to City Council.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* would like to see an item updating matters that the Transportation Commission has spent a lot of time on, such as Line 63. He added that an ILC meeting was held recently, and would like an update since he cannot always attend the meeting.

*Staff Bergman* noted that the ILC meeting consisted of updates on other issues, such as Line 63 and the 51 Task Force. The EcoPass is being pursued, and concerns were raised about the Transbay O line, particularly when the local riders filled the buses in lieu of the 51, preventing the Transbay riders from using the bus.

In response to an inquiry by *Commissioner Schatmeier* regarding the Otis bus stop issue, *Staff Bergman* replied that was part of the Line 63 issue, and would go to Council in January.

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

G:\pubworks\LT\TRANSPORTATION\COMMITTEES\TC\2008\012308\121207minutes-draft.doc